New South

- U. S. Policy on Desegregation
- The Moderate
  H. Franklin Williams
- The Southern Heritage
- Highlights from Recent Literature

OCTOBER 1958

New South

Published by

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

63 Auburn Avenue, N.E., Atlanta 3, Georgia

OCTOBER, 1958

Volume 13 **Number 10**

Contents

U. S. Policy on Desegregation
by William P. Rogers 3

The Moderate
by H. Franklin Williams . . . 8

The Southern Heritage 11

Highlights from Recent Literature . 14

Officers

James McBride Dabbs . . . . . President
Marion A. Wright . . . . . Vice-President
A. W. Dent . . . . . Vice-President
Paul Williams . . . . . Vice-President
Rufus E. Clement
Chairman, Executive Committee
Joseph Haas . . . . . Counsel
Harold C. Fleming . . . Executive Director

Information Staff

John Constable . . . Director of Information
Marge Manderson . . . Research Assistant

Subscription rate . . . . . $2.00 a year

New South is published monthly except August by Southern Regional Council, Inc., 63 Auburn Avenue, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia. Single copies may be purchased at twenty cents each; quantity rates on request.

Contributions to the Southern Regional Council are tax-exempt

New South Notes

The lead *New South* article this month is a reprint of a speech by the United States Attorney General, William P. Rogers, before the American Bar Association. In the speech, Attorney General Rogers outlines the role that the administrative branch of the United States has played and intends to play in the desegregation process. Attorney General Rogers also concerns himself with the role expected of state governments in carrying out the Supreme Court ruling.

Dr. H. Franklin Williams, a vice president of the University of Miami, recently received the Leonard L. Abess Award for Human Relations presented annually by the Florida Regional Advisory Board of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. In his acceptance speech, Dr. Williams gave his description of a moderate and listed some of the things a moderate could do in the current desegregation controversy. In this issue, we reprint Dr. Williams' speech, with the belief that it will be of interest to responsible Southerners who are searching for a reasonable solution to the current problems involving the schools.

James McBride Dabbs, President of the Southern Regional Council, is the author of a new book, *The Southern Heritage*. The book concerns the current problem of desegregation; and so *New South* presents excerpts of reviews of the book, reprinted mostly from Southern newspapers.

Rounding out this issue of *New South* are additional "Highlights from Recent Literature." Two selections, "Can Segregation Survive in an Industrial Society" and "Race Relations in the South," are reported on in this issue.

U. S. POLICY ON DESEGREGATION

By Attorney General William P. Rogers

Speech to American Bar Association

In the Department of Justice we have given much thought to the various aspects of these [school desegregation] problems. Without attempting or purporting to deal with all these various aspects let me say that as I see it, the ultimate issue which emerges does not turn upon the evaluation of particular rules of law. The ultimate issue becomes the role of law itself in our society; whether the law of the land is supreme or whether it may be evaded and defied.

On May 17, 1954, the court announced its unanimous decision—and I quote from the opinion—"that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

The decision was foreshadowed by earlier holdings. Thus, as early as 1938, the court, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, had concluded that a Negro living in Missouri was entitled to study law at the University of Missouri, a state school, there being no other law school maintained by the state which he might attend. The constitutional requirement of "equal protection of the laws" was not deemed satisfied by the state's offer to pay tuition at a school of comparable standing in a near-by state. Then, in 1950, the court, in a unanimous opinion written by Chief Justice Vinson, examined intangible as well as tangible factors in determining that a separate law school maintained by Texas for Negro residents of that state did not provide the same opportunities as were offered by a legal education at the University of Texas.

Notwithstanding this litigation involving public education at the university level, the decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* [in 1954] as you well know, had serious impact on certain sections of our country and was met with apprehension, resentment, and even threats of defiance.

Since the date of that case, holdings of the Supreme Court and of the lower Federal courts emphasize that a state may not engage in other forms of segregation, for example, in providing recreational facilities and in public transportation. The courts have concluded that for a state to enforce sep-

POLICY

(Continued)

aration on the basis of racial criteria, even though the separate facilities provided may be physically similar, is to deny equal protection of the laws.

So the doctrine "separate but equal" must be considered a thing of the past. In other words, a state law which requires a Negro to act or not to act or to do a certain thing, merely and solely because he is a Negro, violates constitutional requirements. For a nation which stands for full equality under the law—which solemnly believes that all men are equal before the law, regardless of race, religion, or place of national origin—the result undoubtedly is permanent. It must be our hope that persons who oppose the decision will see the wisdom and the compelling need, in the national interest, of working out reasonable ways to comply.

In our system of government, of course, the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and it is the function of the judiciary to expound it. This is the very cornerstone of our Federal system. As Hamilton stressed in The Federalist, "the want of a judiciary power" was the circumstance which crowned the defects of the Articles of Confederation.

These difficulties were obviated, in the words of Chief Justice Stone, "by making the Constitution the supreme law of the land and leaving its interpretation to the courts."

The unanimous decision of the court in the recent school cases thus represents the law of the land for today, tomorrow and, I am convinced, for the future—for all regions and for all people. . . .

No one should try to minimize the problems of local adjustment posed in certain areas by these decisions. All of us must be mindful that for some communities the principle of law declared is one which runs against long ingrained habits, customs and practices, which were thought to be consistent with the Constitution . . . To be unmindful of this is to be unreasonable and unrealistic.

Constitutional Principles

The Supreme Court's 1955 opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, dealing with the question of relief, itself recognized that a period of transition would be required and that it would be an unwise procedure to prescribe a uniform period for compliance without regard to varying local conditions. At the same time, however, it must be remembered that the rights declared by the court are personal and present rights. "It should go without saying," the Court declared, that "constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them . . . "

The crux of the matter then is one of intention. The problems are difficult at best but they become hazardous if the underlying intent of those who are opposed to the decision . . . is one of defiance. For the reasons I have mentioned, time and understanding are necessary ingredients to any long term solution. But time to work out constructive measures in an honest effort to comply is one thing; time used as a cloak to achieve complete defiance of the law of the land is quite another. . . .

The responsibility for carrying out the principle declared in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* is primarily that of local officials and of the local community, subject, of course, to the supervision of the courts when the matter is in litigation. In remanding the school cases to the lower courts for further proceedings, the Supreme Court instructed those courts to require that the local school authorities involved "make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance." It also directed that the trial courts consider adequacy of any plans that the school boards might propose as a means of "effectuating" a transition to a racially non-discriminatory school system.

The United States was not a party to the school cases . . . The United States appeared only in the Supreme Court, at the invitation of the court.

Executive Branch

The Executive Branch of your Government does not appear in district court proceedings conducted for purposes of determining whether a proposed school plan is adequate or whether an existing plan should be modified. The details of implementation are for the parties directly involved and for the local court. If such plan as may be approved by the courts is thereupon carried out, there can, of course, be no occasion for participation by the Department of Justice. There is hope that this will be the prevailing pattern and that implementation will go forward consistently with the requirement of law and order and the dictates of good citizenship and good sense. As the President stated . . . , "The common sense of the individual and his civic responsibility must eventually come into play if we are to solve this problem."

There have been a few instances in which we have participated in court actions, not in connection with a proposed school plan, but in order to assure proper respect for law and order and for the decrees of the United States District Courts.

Clinton, Tennessee

One instance of participation by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in the enforcement of orders of a Federal court is a case which arose in Clinton, Tenn. In compliance with a court order, a number of Negroes had been admitted, without incident, to the Clinton High School. Several days later, John Kasper, an agitator for the Seaboard White Citizens Council, arrived to organize concerted obstruction. His purpose was to frustrate the District Court's order and to exert pressure upon the school board to dismiss the Negro students.

At the petition of members of the school board, the court enjoined Kasper from further hindering or obstructing the approved plan. Kasper refused to comply and continued to incite mob action aimed at subverting the court's decree. He was thereupon charged with criminal contempt, again at the instance of the school board members. At this point the United States Attorney, who had not been in the case since it had involved only the predominantly "local" question of formulating an appropriate plan of integration, was requested by the court to participate in the investigation and the prosecution of the criminal contempt charge. This was done and Kasper was convicted and the conviction sustained on appeal.

POLICY

(Continued)

An example of still another way in which the Federal Government has participated in helping to overcome violent interference with a plan of integration is the Hoxie, Ark., case.

Promptly after the Supreme Court's decisions, the Hoxie School Board, finding no administrative obstacle to immediate desegregation, announced that the schools in that district would be open to white and colored children alike.

This was met, however, by threats and acts of violence designed to coerce the school board to rescind its action. The board and its members responded by an action in the Federal District Court to enjoin the agitators from interfering with the desegregation of the Hoxie schools and from threatening or intimidating the school board members in the performance of their duties. The injunction was granted, but the defendants appealed on the ground that no Federal rights were involved and the Federal courts had no jurisdiction. The appeal thus raised the broad question whether state officials can be protected in the Federal courts from interference with their performance of a duty imposed upon them by the Federal Constitution. Because of the effect the decision would have upon the procedures available for dealing with obstructions to duly-adopted plans of desegregation, the United States at the request of the school board and with the consent of all the parties, appeared and filed a brief in the Court of Appeals in support of the power of the Federal courts. The injunction was affirmed. . . .

[If] there is concerted and substantial interference, as in the Kasper case, with the decree of the court, we [the Federal Government] stand prepared to take such steps as may be necessary to vindicate the court's authority, for example, to aid the court in the prosecution of a contempt charge. We are prepared to assist the courts in other ways—as in the Hoxie case, where, at the request of the local school board, we submitted our views on an important question involving the formulation of effective federal procedures for dealing with threatened obstruction of law and order.

This brings me finally to the most serious situation, and one which all Americans solemly hope will never occur again. I refer to the case where a state impedes the execution of a court's final decree in one of two ways: (1) under the guise of preventing disorder it uses state military forces in a manner calculated to obstruct a final order of the court, or (2) where a state fails to provide adequate police protection to those whose rights have been determined by final decree of the court and as a result "domestic violence, unlawful combination or conspiracy" hinders the exercise of those rights. . .

Law and Order

President Eisenhower has clearly stated on two occasions:

"The very basis of our individual rights and freedoms rests upon the certainty that the President and the Executive Branch of Government will support and insure the carrying out of the decisions of the Federal Courts."

Each state, I believe, is fully capa-

ble of maintaining law and order within the state. There is no state, granting the will, which cannot maintain law and order and at the same time permit a final decree of a court to be carried out. This being so, no further occasion need arise — which should require the Federal Government to act to support and insure the carrying out of a final decision of a Federal Court.

Responsible state officials must exercise wisdom and foresight to prevent violence and the defiance of court decrees. Our nation pays a heavy price for such disorder both at home and abroad—particularly when it is the product of an attempt to deny to fellow American citizens rights duly determined by our courts.

No Exemption

In any civilization based upon ordered liberty, it is fundamental, in the words of John Locke, a favored philosopher of the Founding Fathers, that "no man in civil society can be exempted from the laws of it." By the same token, no man can be excepted from the requirement of respecting the lawfully determined rights of others. Every thoughtful and responsible persons know this to be true. . .

In summary then let me restate these conclusions:

1. The decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases and in related fields is the law of the land.

2. Compliance with the law of the land is inevitable. As the President said . . . , "Every American must understand that if an individual, a community, or a state is going successfully and continuously to defy the court then there will be anarchy."

3. In the final analysis, therefore, it is vital in the national interest that there be thoughtful complaince in conformity with the general guideline laid down by the Supreme Court and in a manner specifically worked out by local authority under supervision of the local Federal courts.

Good Faith

4. Whenever good-faith efforts to comply have been made by local and state officials, substantial progress has been made without serious incident.

5. Each state has the clear, affirmative duty to use its police power so that the lawfully determined rights of all persons are protected against violence and lawlessness.

6. Most states have made it clear that they are able to and intend to perform this duty. If each state performs its duty the occasion should never arise, and I am sure that all of us fervently hope that it will not arise, when the ultimate duty would fall upon the Executive Branch of Government "to support and insure the carrying out of the final decision of the Federal Court."

7. We in the Executive Branch stand ready at all times in a spirit of cooperation to consult with state officials in a search for solution consistent with the decisions of the court.

The problems I have discussed here . . . present a serious challenge to all Americans in the days ahead. With an awareness of the gravity of these problems which face our nation there is but one course to pursue. We are one nation, with total dedication to the rule of law. We must always remain so.

THE MODERATE

By H. Franklin Williams

Acceptance Speech
for
Leonard L. Abess Award in Human Relations,
Florida Board, Anti-Defamation League

Studying the events of the past and the changes in society, the historian finds it easy to understand how progress has been made by the vast majority of men who stand between the extremes of the agitator and the die-hard conservative. He sees that those nations have been greatest and freest which have learned to accept gradual progress rather than revolutionary change. In the past the moderate has been a man in a secure position, esteemed by the majority because he has seemed neither to advocate radical change nor to refuse all possibility of change. In the Anglo-Saxon tradition where freedom has grown from precedent to precedent, the moderate has had wide support because he has stood for legality and conformity. He has been one of many. He has not had to sing alone, for many of us are afraid that we cannot carry a tune as a solo, but has enjoyed the comforting sound of a chorus of voices around him, to which he can happily contribute his song. This happy situation no longer exists, because now and here in the South the stand for moderation has become controversial. In these troubled times it has even become controversial to stand for respect of the law. And this concerns me personally because, as a member of the administration of the University of Miami, I have the responsibility to make it clear that in which I have to say today I speak for myself alone, not for the University of Miami nor for any other organization of which I am a member. To such a pass have we come today.

The moderate in America is a man who accepts principles of our society as essential to the existence of a moral society. He sees our society as based on the fundamental moral principle that the individual personality, the individual freedom of choice, the development of the individual character are the basic purposes of a moral society. He has moved readily to the application of this principle in the political doctrine of equality before the law. In the last few years the thoughtful moderate has had to face the question of race relations and has found himself forced to accept the position taken by the Supreme Court as essential if we are to have a moral society. He inevitably has come to the position so cogently stated by Bishop Louttit a few nights ago in his address to the Dade County Council of Community Relations. Now the moderate is essentially a conformist, a man

who desires to respect and obey the law. Having heard the Supreme Court state the law in a fashion which his conscience cannot refute, he desires to see that the law applied and enforced. But, being a conformist, he also believes in order. All his past experience has led him to believe that adherence to the law and moral principles will ensure order. Now he is told that the proposed acceptance of law will invite disorder. He seems to be forced to choose between two extremes, both repugnant to him. He is told that he can have principle without order or that he can have order without principle. This is his dilemma.

Moderates have reacted to their present dilemma in different ways. Most of the moderates have fallen silent and become indecisive. They have developed a sort of catatonic schizophrenia. They look for leaders who will embody the principles of law and order which they respect and find none. They have no rallying point. Others heard the statement "I am ready to accept desegregation of the schools, but it is impossible to carry it through." This attitude is common on boards of trustees and school boards. I have wondered whether the moderates should not arrange to interview members of such boards separately, obtain the familiar statement from them, and then confront them in full meeting with their several statements. Some have tried to cover conformity with local customs, in violation of their principles, by quibbles about the state law as in conflict with the Supreme Court decision, or by saying that we must wait for a court decision. Since when have Americans had to wait for a court decision when the law is clear? Some who call themselves moderates have stood for delay without proposing any steps in the direction of acceptance of the law. This attitude is all too common, particularly among those holding elected offices in this state. Some, in the name of moderation, have even yielded ground out of caution. There are, for example, a number of Southern cities in which the Urban League has been dropped from Community Chest or United Fund because it stands clearly for desegregation.

Movement

I would like to suggest that there is a position for the moderates that comes much closer than any of the stands which I have outlined to satisfying both demands of their consciences, the demand for law and principle, and the demand for order. It is a position of movement. The position is a difficult one, one which sometimes calls for courage, and, in a world of extremists may involve some personal risk to the person who expresses it. It has, however, powerful backing in those parts of the Supreme Court's decision which are often forgotten, the parts which admit the possibility of local variation in the speed with which the decision is to be carried out. Relying on that concept, the moderate can insist that we begin action at once. If conditions forbid action, we can at least plan for it. We must never sit down and wait for conditions to change but must take an initiative to bring out a change. This position means now in the South that the moderate cannot look around for a leader to follow but must himself take a position of leadership on the assump-

MODERATE

(Continued)

tion that because his position is in accord with the underlying principles on which our government is based, others will eventually follow and rally to him. In this fashion he can begin to move out of his dilemma. It may take a long time to reach the objective and to fully enjoy both law and order. But if he does not forget the objective, he can satisfy his conscience by striving toward it.

The moderate taking this position will find himself charged with abandoning the great principle of State's Rights. It seems to me that he has a very pat answer in the fact that State's Rights will be safest when the states do right.

It may be useful to spell out the meaning of this position of motion for the individual man who regards himself as a moderate. First of all, he must cling to his fundamental beliefs. He must hold to the principle that if our society is to be good it must give respect for every individual, that it must offer every individual freedom before the law and freedom of opportunity. Then he must satisfy himself that his adherence to this principle and its expression in the law as set down by the Supreme Court is compatible with order, because the court has recognized the necessity for gradual achievement of school desegregation. The moderate must not hold this view passively and within himself. He must state his views and must believe that since his view is based on principle there are others who will hold the same view. I can think of no better illustration and encouragement for this action than the experience of last year's winner of this award, Representative John B. Orr. His clear stand in this sense turned out not to be political suicide, as many people said it would be. He spoke at a time when he was up for reelection. He did not lose the election, but was returned to office. Another thing which the moderate must do is to seek out organizations of like-minded individuals, organizations dedicated both to law and to the maintenance of order. If he does not find such organizations, it is his responsibility to create them.

The position which I am proposing for the moderate calls for a deep-seated and almost mystic faith in our free system of government and society. No man can take this stand unless he believes, as we all must believe, that a free society is based on right. If a man holds to what is right, he will not stand alone. This lies at the very heart of our system. If any one of us felt that he alone stood for right, he could well ask himself what value there was in his vote, one among millions. But our system is based on the idea that when we take a stand or cast a vote conscientiously, millions will be doing the same thing and the voice will not be a single one, but one voice in a vast chorus. The times call for the moderate now to sing a solo even if he is not sure that he can carry the tune, confident in the belief that before long his fellow citizens will join in the song of freedom. If he has the courage to do this now, he can hope in the future to return to the inconspicuous position of conformity that he prefers, confident that his society is based on moral principles.

THE SOUTHERN HERITAGE

THE SOUTHERN HERITAGE. By James McBride Dabbs. 273 pp. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $4.00.

Following are excerpts of reviews, mostly from Southern papers, of Mr. Dabbs' book.

Mr. Dabbs is, among other things, an elder in the Presbyterian Church and President of the Southern Regional Council, a Southwide organization working interracially. Both affiliations have helped him in his examination.

Through an excellent anlaysis, Mr. Dabbs shows how an enormous weight of cumulative guilt produced by the years of injustice done the Negro by exploitations and discriminations has fixed itself upon white Southerners.

Mr. Dabbs deals skillfully with many of the inexplicable and unreasonable paradoxes in Southern life. Other writers have noted the insistence of extremists on "white supremacy" and the companion fear that if there are not strict laws of separation there might be general intermarriage. Mr. Dabbs traces this curious conflict further. In his small-town discussions, he had listened to those who declare that God himself in his infinite wisdom established segregation and that every true Southerner knows "instinctively" that the races are meant to be separate. He has not endeared himself to them by asking why then, if this be known, there must be strict Jim Crow laws? There is, of course, no basis for declaring the Negro inferior as a human being and a person. Mr. Dabbs' satire will be devastating to those who think otherwise.

Other Southern writers have come to the same conclusion reached by Mr. Dabbs, namely that in this great issue, the South has made the fatal error of committing itself on the wrong side of a moral issue and to another "Lost Cause." He deduces that the slow, sometimes glacier-like processes of law, plus industrialization, the democratic spirit and the Christian tradition are at work for elimination of racial discrimination . . . and he writes from a Deep South state out of a rich experience. It would be good if it could be distributed, as are the Gideon Bibles, in the localities that most need to read it—Ralph McGill, *Atlanta Constitution.*

• • •

Early in this book, Mr. Dabbs says that "the South developed the psychology of a folk society and the needs of an industrial society." His thinking, and in one sense his life, bridges the gap between the two societies. When he says that the need of the South today is for "practical poets," for those who can weave the desirable old into the desirable new for the good of all, Mr. Dabbs might be characterizing and evaluating his own contribution—Wilma Dykeman Stokely, *Chattanooga Times.*

HERITAGE

(Continued)

No one can make a statement on the race problem that will be completely agreed with by all Southerners. Mr. Dabbs, however, has given us a sound historical study of the problem, one that will be a valuable source of information for all Southerners—Ben W. Griffith, *Savannah News.*

• • •

One might expect that with his background, Mr. Dabbs would call for the continuation of segregation. But, to put it shortly and perhaps bluntly, he agrees with those who say there is no tenable moral ground for segregation. Further, after an extensive survey of the reasons behind the rise and growth of segregation in the South, he outlines arguments offered by the non-mixers and then proceeds to demolish these arguments, whether they be economic, political, prestige or religious. — *Charlotte News.*

• • •

The South, Dabbs feels, does indeed possess exceptional cultural values, and should preserve them. The so-called Southern Way of Life, however, does not depend on segregation . . . He examines carefully, even respectfully, the Southern traditions and attitudes which he believes are retarding the South. Where necessary, they are related to the antebellum South, to slavery, to Reconstruction, then brought up to date and exposed to present light.—Luther Carter, *Norfolk Pilot.*

. . . he asks us to remember the penetrating comment of another writer: "Southern leaders who are working with marked success, to industrialize the region are undermining the system of segregation so many of them passionately defend."

Nothing about all this dismays Mr. Dabbs in the least because by approaching industrialism in a timid way we have not allowed it half a chance to do what it can for us. That of course is "to raise the standard of living." Let us face that problem and "as we tackle it, racial problems will tend to solve themselves and we shall give to a world wherein hungry and humiliated people demand machines and equality a vision both of plenty and of peace, peace between the races and within ourselves." In short, "let's bring the diesel home."

If I read him correctly this seems, in brief, the thesis of what the author has to say. His work reflects the honest and serious struggle of a native Southerner, both with an abiding problem and with his own conscience—Richmond C. Beatty, *Nashville Tennessean.*

• • •

Mr. Dabbs has done what many writers have done before him, but his results are tied more to contemprorary living . . . It must be understood that Mr. Dabbs is a Southerner, although some may confuse his viewpoint. He presents a far-reaching statement of principle which every Southerner, Negro and white, would profit by reading—Jack Stillman, *Birmingham News.*

• • •

The author finds that there are certain positive forces within and beyond

the South which are working toward a solution of the region's problems of race relations—forces such as the pioneering spirit, democratic tradition which produced a Thomas Jefferson, belief in justice, and "the central fire burning at the heart of the South . . . the Christian spirit of love." Mr. Dabbs' portrait of the two races living together in the South is a penetrating and perceptive one, written with understanding and love of the region and her peoples . . . Recommended.—John David Marshall, Head, Acquis. Div., University of Georgia Lib., Athens, Ga., *Library Journal.*

• • •

It is reasonably safe to say that if all literate white Southerners were handed this book today with the suggestion they read it through without reference to the publishers' comments and the dust cover, an astonishingly high percentage would not proceed beyond the second of its 18 chapters. And this despite the fact that it is clearly written, informative and, in places, impressively engrossing. But it is also written from a line of reasoning that would give willing acceptance to relinquishment of the traditional barriers against racial segregation. — William H. Stauffer, *Richmond Times Dispatch.*

• • •

Here is a thoughtful and valuable essay, in which a Southerner raises the question: Is the South getting its money's worth in defending segregation? . . . The price of segregation, he concludes, has been too great. Other values constitute the true SOUTHERN HERITAGE. — Gene Fretz, *Arkansas Gazette.*

For Southern readers his qualifications are beyond reasonable question. Born in South Carolina and a graduate of its state unversity, Dabbs is now a plantation owner as well as a freelance writer. President of the Southern Regional Council and a member of the Executive Committee of the Fellowship of Southern Churchmen, he is prominently associated with the liberal movement for interracial cooperation in the South.

The title of the book appropriately suggests the perspective from which it was written. Dabbs maintains that segregation, far from being an essential element of our way of life, actually runs counter to the best features of the "Southern heritage . . . " The peculiar merit of this carefully reasoned case lies in the fact that the writer has found in Southern history new meanings which are at variance with traditional interpretations and has skillully marshaled the findings of the social sciences in a comprehensive critical analysis of the system of color-caste. To accomplish this task in a singularly persuasive manner, without bitterness and in rare good temper, is to introduce, into the present debate over integregation, a refreshing air of urbanity and rationality. — G. Cary White, *Roanoke Times.*

Transcript of "A Mike Wallace Interview with James McBride Dabbs," a survival and freedom production by the Fund for the Republic. Single copies available free from The Southern Regional Council, 63 Auburn Ave., Ave., N.E., Atlanta 3, Ga.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM RECENT LITERATURE

NEW SOUTH summarizes recently published periodical, pamphlet, and book length material of interest to its readers. These synopses liberally paraphrase and condense the statements of the authors, although direct quotations are used whenever economy permits.

Yinger, J. Milton and Simpson, George E. CAN SEGREGATION SURVIVE IN AN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY? The *Antioch Review*, Spring, 1958, pp. 15-24.

Dramatic changes in the structure of American society are "surrounding" and undermining the foundation of the segregation system. Urbanization, the increase in industrial jobs with hourly pay rates, the beginnings of unionization, diversification of jobs for Negroes, the growth in literacy and awareness of democratic values, the sharp increase in the size of the urban middle class, a growing integration of the national economy — these and other forces are changing the patterns of race relations in all parts of the country.

An urban, mobile, industrial society applies impersonal, "functional" criteria to associations. Some of the ways in which segregation patterns are now being replaced support this thesis.

Weakness in any part of the system of segregation is felt throughout the system; equally true, one firm segment re-enforces all the others (as continued residential segregation exemplifies). Although it will not disappear quietly or immediately, segregation is crumbling. It belongs to another age.

Patrick, Rembert W. RACE RELATIONS IN THE SOUTH. Pamphlet, available through Florida State Teachers Association, P. O. Box 1211, Tallahassee, Florida, .25c per single copy. 21 pages. 1958.

Numerous myths — fashioned to fit the dreams of her interpreters—abound about the South and about race relations in the South. Mr. Patrick explodes some of these myths and concludes that since 1954 race relations *have* deteriorated, and the cause is obvious. Moderates on race relations have made few protests against the actions of agitators.

The results of the last few years are peculiarly unfortunate. After decades of poverty, the number one economic problem of the nation was becoming a land of opportunity. Economic loss resulting from segregation is a known fact, but an even greater danger is threatened by individuals who advocate closing the public schools. In the world of today, the United States cannot afford any limitation placed upon education. Any victory which the segregationists may win today will be temporary. The caste system cannot endure with a majority of the nation and of the world in opposition to it.

. . . Unquote

"We appeal to the President of the United States to lend the prestige of his office in this time of racial tensions by providing moral initative and executive leadership in the belief that a strong position taken by the President would go far in encouraging these citizens who sincerely desire to see the law obeyed and enforced."

National Council of Methodist Youth, Quoted in CONCERN

• • •

"Basic to the idea of 'law and order' is human dignity. We believe that the individual's character is not to be willfully destroyed or damaged by the words or acts of another. We aim to be the kind of society in which each person can feel safe from violence. We believe that the law must protect ALL citizens—their families and homes, their places of work and worship."

Kathryn H. Stone, Member, Virginia House of Delegates, Quoted in WASHINGTON POST

• • •

"Since the flare-up at Central High School a year ago, not a single major new plant has been located in the city's (Little Rock) metropolitan area and no land in Little Rock's 1,000-acre industrial district, just outside of town, has been sold since May, 1957."

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

"I think it (closing the schools) is a terrible thing, the worst thing they can do. It should be the last thing done. Give up the schools and what have you got left—ignorance and poverty."

North Carolina Bank Executive, Quoted in ATLANTA JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION

• • •

"Atlanta will not be the Triple A farm club of the Milwaukee Braves next season . . . The Braves, it was understood, reached a verdict eliminating Atlanta for two reasons:

(1) Atlanta was considered a bad risk for the placement of its Negro players;

(2) The Southern Assn. was prepared to put up a strenuous fight against the drafting of the Atlanta territory . . . "

Furman Bisher, Sports Editor, ATLANTA JOURNAL

• • •

"Warren County, (Va.), is known as a peaceable, well-ordered community, favorable to business and industrial development. Respected citizens are interested in adding new industry to our community. But would new business and other industry be attracted to a community with no public school or to a community with only second rate private schools of a dubious constitutionality?"

13 *Warren County, Va., Ministers, Quoted in* WASHINGTON POST